

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 2, 2008. Claims 1-10 remain in this application. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8 are in independent form. In view of the amendments above and the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objection

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.21(d) because every circuit block in FIGS. 2 and 3 must be properly labeled. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed proposed drawing change including a proper labeling of every circuit block in FIGS. 2 and 3.

Specification Objections

(I) In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to for failing to include section headings. Applicants respectfully decline to add headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

(II) In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to for failing to include an abstract. By means of the present amendment, an Abstract has been added as shown. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

112, Second Paragraph Objections

(I) In the Office Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection of claims 1-5 is understood to be based on the premise that the phrase, “the system for rendering information” is unclear and cannot be understood. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove any indefiniteness.

(II) In the Office Action, Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection of claims 1-2 is understood to be based on the premise that the phrase, “cooperating” is unclear and cannot be understood. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to remove any indefiniteness.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,373,799 (Ono).

Applicants respectfully submit that the office has failed to meet its burden to explain with reasonable specificity why it would have been obvious to someone with the level of skill in the art at the time of the invention to use magnetic flux for powering the IC. Applicants submit that Ono lacks any teaching or suggestion of using magnetic flux for powering the IC. The office states that anyone of ordinary skill in the art **would have been motivated** to modify the power receiver of ONO et al’s optical IC disc for receiving magnetic flux as claimed. Such a statement fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. A statement that the modification of the prior art, to meet the claimed

invention would have been obvious to someone with the level of skill in the art at the time of the invention merely because the power receiver of Ono is capable of receiving power wirelessly from outside IC 3, with the rectifier converting signals from electromagnetic receiver 10 into power is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason indicating why one would be motivated to utilize magnetic flux to solve the problem solved by applicant's invention **to arrive at applicant's claimed features**. Specifically, Applicant's fail to appreciate how it would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at an Integrated Circuit solution comprising communication means for contactlessly communicating with a device and a power supply coil for generating supply power from low frequency magnetic flux changes created by moving an integrated circuit through a magnetic field having flux areas with positive and negative magnetic flux.


The fact that one of ordinary skill in the art has the capabilities to arrive at the invention is not the test for whether one of ordinary skill in the art based on the teachings of the prior art. (Ex Parte Levengood – impetus required)

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1- 10 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-945-6000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001